



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*MODERN METHODS IN NEW TESTAMENT PHILOLOGY*

SAMUEL ANGUS

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The language of the Greek New Testament has been under the continual search-light of criticism since the early part of the seventeenth century, when the keen debate between the Purist and the Hebraist produced a copious literature. The former laid a very heavy burden on his own shoulders. Although he could easily argue for his thesis of the "purity" of the New Testament language by citing numberless parallels between it and the best Greek writers, it was hard to account for the many points of divergence, and consequently the Hebraist steadily gained ground. Antecedent probability, as well as common sense, seemed to be on the side of the latter. For the New Testament was akin to the Septuagint, and that was regarded as a treasure-house of Semitisms. Moreover most of the writers of the New Testament were Jews, and nothing seemed more natural than that their Greek should be deeply tinged with the idioms of their native tongue. Accordingly Hebraism was granted large concessions, and under it were included not only the Greek expressions which happened to have sister-constructions in Hebrew or Aramaic, but also many usages peculiar to Greek but unusual in the days of the best Attic. These Semitisms were supposed so to affect syntax, vocabulary, and style as to make the result un-greek.

The victory of the Hebraists led finally to another view which for long hindered New Testament philology. Enthusiasts regarded the New Testament language as in every sense sacred, too sublime to submit to rules, governed by laws of its own caprice. They were so impressed with the treasures conveyed to them that they came to deem the conveying vessel divine. In other words, they canonized the language as well as the subject-matter. In 1860 Rothe used the oft-quoted words: "It is indeed proper to speak of a 'language of the Holy Spirit'; for the Bible offers

ocular demonstration of the way in which the divine Spirit has fashioned a unique religious dialect out of the languages of each of those communities that formed the scene of His revealing activity,"—words which were repeated by Cremer in the ninth edition of his *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch* (1902).

On the other side the classical scholar too often flouted the language of the New Testament as a mere jargon, unworthy of attention beside the studied art of classicism. For him it was a stone of stumbling, it contravened all rules by which he wrote his own artificial prose, and it offered an amusing field for pedantic correction. At a glance he could see that New Testament Greek is decidedly "unclassical." His eyes were fixed upon the stately style of Thucydides, the rounded phrases of Attic oratory, the majesty of Athenian drama, or the prose poetry of Plato, and he failed to see the different, but no less striking, merits of the New Testament writers.

The modern era in New Testament philology began about the end of the first quarter of the last century when G. B. Winer published (1822) the first edition of his *New Testament Greek Grammar*. The ancient Sanskrit literature had been brought to the knowledge of European scholars in the closing decades of the eighteenth century, and in the beginning of the nineteenth the new science of comparative philology had been founded. This put an end to much of the superficial empiricism of earlier methods, and gave a new impetus to linguistic study. Philology was no longer an incomplete and mechanical process of compilation of examples and exceptions. Thorough scientific and comparative sifting was necessary before proper deductions could be drawn and rules laid down; and language had now to be viewed as a living organism evolving itself according to psychological and physical conditions. No arbitrary external standards might be imposed upon it, its laws could be inferred only from an investigation of its internal constitution.

It was Winer's merit to realize to some extent what this new science meant for New Testament Greek, and he was able to give a wider outlook, and to inaugurate a period of immense activity in the philological study of the New Testament. Many editions and translations of his grammar appeared during his

lifetime and after his death; and the awakened interest was promptly directed to lexicographical work, and to the study of synonyms and the making of concordances. But New Testament Greek still retained its isolation, neither emancipated from the shackles of Hebraism nor elevated above the scorn of the classicist. It was still customary to speak of New Testament, or Biblical, or Christian, Greek as something specifically independent, uncorrelated with the contemporary secular language of its time. The dogma of verbal inspiration was so understood as to chill scientific appreciation. Christianity was supposed to have made for herself a select language as well as a peculiar people.

But the nineteenth century accumulated a great store of new materials for study in this field. Since the day when August Bœckh launched his huge *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* (1828) a vast wealth of inscriptions has been brought to us from all parts of the once far-extending Greek world. Even more significant have been the surprising finds of thousands of unliterary and literary papyri preserved to us by the dry climate and sand of Egypt. From the rubbish heaps of the same country, and of its southern neighbor, large numbers of inscribed potsherds, or "ostraca," have found their way into our hands. With the use of this material the present generation has seen the beginning of still a third period of New Testament philology, in which have come profoundly important changes in method and point of view.

Until the present generation even epigraphy scarcely affected New Testament study, Bœckh's great collection of inscriptions being mainly ignored by students of the New Testament. It is now demonstrated that the New Testament vocabulary did not stand isolated, but was one with the vernacular of its day, the so-called Koinê, or "common dialect" of the Hellenistic-Roman world in which it had its origin. In it the influence of many contemporary political and religious conceptions not connected with the Old Testament can be clearly recognized. To Adolf Deissmann<sup>1</sup> belongs the credit of inaugurating this new era and of

<sup>1</sup> Bibelstudien, Beiträge zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften zur Geschichte der Sprache, des Schrifttums und der Religion des hellenistischen Juden

opening a great future for the further prosecution of New Testament philology by showing the lexical connection of the New Testament with the inscriptions, the papyri, and the writers of the Koinê.

The next requisite was a more exact knowledge of the contemporary Koinê, and the philologist Albert Thumb has now depicted for us the origin and nature of this type of Greek and its true place in the history of the Greek language. He confirmed Deissmann's position and went further, by bringing to bear both on the Koinê and on New Testament Greek a wide knowledge of modern popular Greek, by the aid of which, among other things, he strengthened the case against Hebraisms.

With these scholars should be named James Hope Moulton, *patriis laborum heres*, now professor of Hellenistic Greek in Victoria University, Manchester. He supplemented Deissmann's discoveries from collections of inscriptions and papyri previously unused, and has now in the field of New Testament grammar demonstrated<sup>2</sup> that the accidence and syntax of the New Testament are substantially those of the vernacular Koinê. His work is the more valuable because, following Thumb's example, he has availed himself of the evidence to be drawn from modern Greek.

That the progress of philology has thus broken down the wall of partition for the language of the New Testament and removed its erstwhile isolation is a great service to the right understanding of the book's contents. The result has been not to impoverish but to enrich the meaning of many words, as we come to see their origin and significance in the contemporary pagan world. Thus we now know that such words and expressions as σωτήρ, κύριος, υἱὸς θεοῦ, εὐαγγέλιον, κυριακή ἡμέρα and many others, are not of Christian coinage, but are taken from the religious language of the surrounding heathen or Jewish world. As Christianity came

tums und des Urchristentums, 1895; Neue Bibelstudien, Sprachgeschichtliche Beiträge zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften zur Erklärung des Neuen Testaments, 1897 (English translation in one volume, Bible Studies, 1901, 21903); New Light on the New Testament, 1907; The Philology of the Greek Bible, 1908; Licht vom Osten; das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt, 1908.

<sup>2</sup> A Grammar of New Testament Greek, vol. i, Prolegomena, 1906, <sup>2</sup>1906, <sup>3</sup>1908.

at first to "the poor ones," "the meek," and "the little ones" of this world, she did not disdain their language, but sought to make herself intelligible in the every-day speech of the common man. Her language is the natural, unaffected language of the heart, quite at one with that of the lower and middle classes and always intelligible to them. Its place is with the spoken rather than with the written Koinê. The authors of the New Testament, taken as a whole, had no thought of fame or of distant ages, but wrote for the need of the time in which they lived, the while their thoughts were occupied with the supposedly near approach of the Parousia. The New Testament has become literature, has produced literature, and has dominated literature in spite of the fact that it was not primarily intended for literature. The classical period of Attic Greek was one of beauty in outward things and of form, one in which art was cherished for its own sake; the classical excellence of New Testament Greek lies in its simplicity and direct forcefulness, the beauty is of the matter. The great literary achievement of the New Testament is the fact that it has made literature out of common colloquial speech and reared an eternal monument of the language of the lower strata of society.

The principal uncial MSS. in which our New Testament text has been preserved were written between 300 and 500 A.D., in a time of atticizing tendency. We should therefore expect that a popular or plebeian character of the autographs would not always be strictly preserved. They were in fact "corrected," not modernized but archaized, or atticized, in details. Wellhausen<sup>3</sup> maintains that Codex Bezae often preserves the more plebeian character of the original text. Even in the days of the autographs this tendency was in some degree present; we find Matthew, and to a still greater extent the more elegant Luke, correcting or removing plebeianisms of Mark. The tendency toward greater elegance in language naturally increased when Christianity conquered her former oppressors and made herself recognized as the established religion of the Roman Empire. Luke, as just said, set the example in the preparation of his works for "his Excellency, Theophilus," and when Christianity gained her place of

<sup>3</sup> Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien, 1905. p. 13.

power at the courts of potentates and began to reside in palaces (both royal and episcopal), she began to pay more attention to outward form and to array herself in court-dress.<sup>4</sup>

No one maintains that Christianity was able to pour all her new concepts into the old lexical vessels. It is not to be denied that distinctively Christian words sprang up, but these are much less numerous than was supposed a few years ago. Kennedy<sup>5</sup> calculated that about 550 out of the 5000 words in the New Testament were "Biblical," that is about twelve per cent. On the other hand Deissmann reckons<sup>6</sup> that not more than fifty new formations, or one per cent, are to be found, for "primitive Christianity was a revolution of the inmost life of man, but not a revolution of the Greek lexicon." Christianity did little in her early days to increase the number of words to be registered in a Greek lexicon; her work was to enrich and deepen their meaning. Later on, in the ecclesiastical period of dogma and apologetics, the word-minting capacity of the church was considerably increased.

Upon Semitisms, including both Hebraisms and Aramaisms, the flood-gates of advancing New Testament philology have been opened wide, and this once stately edifice has now fallen to ruins. On the same principle on which the Semitists collected their array of Semitisms, we might now take almost any civilized language, English, German, or French, and by comparing it with the Greek of the New Testament find enough coincidences to justify, if priority in time permitted, a claim of Anglicisms, Teutonisms, or Gallicisms. The search for Semitisms has been carried to high degrees of absurdity. Even at the present day it is still well represented in the grammatical works of the Abbé Viteau,<sup>7</sup> who describes *un énorme mélange d'hébraïsmes*. Viteau, however, is

<sup>4</sup> Cf. E. Schwyzer, *Die Weltsprachen des Altertums in ihrer geschichtlichen Stellung*, 1902, p. 32.

<sup>5</sup> *Sources of New Testament Greek*, 1895, pp. 60-83, and p. 93.

<sup>6</sup> *Expositor*, Jan. 1908, pp. 70, 71. Cf. also Licht vom Osten, p. 47, "In der religiös schöpferischen Urzeit ist die wortbildende Kraft des Christentums bei weitem nicht so gross, als seine begriffsumbildende Wirkung."

<sup>7</sup> *Étude sur le Grec du Nouveau Testament; Le verbe, syntaxe des propositions*, 1893; *Sujet, complément et attribut*, 1896.

reasonable as compared with A. Schlatter,<sup>8</sup> who has laboriously compared the language of the Fourth Gospel word for word and sentence for sentence with the Hebrew of a Rabbinical commentary on Exodus, and finds Hebraisms in such natural and colorless expressions as *οὐ τίς ἐγώ*; and *πᾶς ἄνθρωπος*. Neither Deissmann nor Moulton would deny that Semitic influence is to be found in the language of the Septuagint<sup>9</sup> and New Testament, but they hold that it was exerted chiefly in the realm of style and of ideas. The Septuagint is naturally more "Hebraic," being "translation Greek." Its thoughts were first cast in old Hebrew forms and later recast in those of the Hellenistic language, and of necessity it has retained the marks of its oriental origin.

In the New Testament we must differentiate those parts which are free Greek from those which were composed or translated from Aramaic originals. Some of the New Testament writers were more Jews than Hellenists;<sup>10</sup> their minds worked in Aramaic, and it would be impossible that such men should write as good idiomatic Greek as a native Hellenist. They did not use many wholly un-greek expressions, but, as Moulton phrases it, over-worked possible, but unidiomatic, Hellenistic expressions when they happened to correspond with Semitic usage. "A Semitism which definitely contravenes Greek syntax" is rare. It is wrong to ascribe to Semitic influences every breach in concord and every reminder of the fact that the New Testament was not primarily written for the schools. A residuum of real Semitisms, though small, cannot be denied, especially in view of the work of Dalman<sup>11</sup> and Wellhausen.<sup>12</sup> There is no occasion in the ardor of recent

<sup>8</sup> *Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten*, 1902; see Thumb's withering criticism in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, 1906, p. 461.

<sup>9</sup> Jean Psichari in a learned "Essai sur le Grec de la Septante," in the *Revue des études juives*, April, 1908, points out by way of protest against Deissmann and Moulton certain Hebraisms to be detected by the use of modern popular Greek.

<sup>10</sup> A notable exception is Paul, who, though a Hebrew of Hebrews, spoke Greek like a second mother-tongue, and thought in Greek. See, however, Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 3d ed., i, p. 33; cf. the literature noted by Milligan, *Commentary on Thessalonians*, p. lv, and Jülicher, "Hellenism," in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*.

<sup>11</sup> *Die Worte Jesu*, 1898, English translation, 1902.

<sup>12</sup> *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 1905, pp. 1-43.



conversion for us to carry the reaction too far. Nevertheless, a safe attitude will be that recommended by an unknown anti-semitic letter-writer of August 4, A.D. 41,<sup>13</sup> καὶ σὺ βλέπε σατὸν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

Closely allied to Semitisms, and even more completely laid than they, is the ghost of a Jewish or Judaeo-Christian Greek, the existence of which as a special and separate idiom of the Koinê is maintained by Zahn<sup>14</sup> and Viteau and, under the name of *hellenistisches Idiom*, by Winer-Schmiedel.<sup>15</sup> The idea is built largely on hypothesis, and the corresponding facts are wanting. As between the home-keeping Palestinian Jews and the Jews of the Diaspora the former were, it is true, the more conservative in language, as in customs and religion. Palestine in the first century was certainly bi-lingual, and the existence of two languages side by side no doubt caused interaction, which would be felt especially by the weaker language. Aramaic was spoken by our Lord, as by Palestinian Jews in general when at home or in company with their fellow-countrymen. But although Palestine was not so thoroughly hellenized as Syria, Egypt, or Asia Minor, the language of Hellenism surrounded Aramaic on all sides. It was the language of culture, and occupied an eminent position as the language of the Roman government, so that the people must in some measure have become acquainted with it. It was also the language of commerce, and wherever any commercial advantage is to be gained by the knowledge of another tongue the Jew has never allowed it to be lost. But because a Palestinian Jew may have spoken this foreign tongue unidiomatically, that does not prove that there was a current Jewish-Greek dialect. Of any peculiar Jewish pronunciation of Greek we have no trace,<sup>16</sup> although we do know of a Syrian pronunciation.

<sup>13</sup> Aegyptische Urkunden aus den kgl. Museen zu Berlin: Griechische Urkunden, vol. iv, 1907, no. 1079; quoted also in Licht vom Osten, p. 82, footnote 6.

<sup>14</sup> "Die griechische Sprache unter den Juden," Einleitung in das Neue Testament<sup>3</sup>, i, pp. 24-52.

<sup>15</sup> G. B. Winer's Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms, 8th ed., 1894, p. 25.

<sup>16</sup> Thumb, op. cit., p. 177.

Outside Palestine there is still less reason to speak of a specific Jewish Greek. The Jew, whenever he left the home-land, became hellenized. No doubt the average new-comers from Palestine did not speak with the facility of those who had been longer and in more immediate contact with Greek. But among the cosmopolitan Jews Greek gained ground and Aramaic was gradually forgotten, so that in the third century B.C. a Greek translation of the Scriptures was called for in Egypt. In fact, wherever outside of Palestine the Jew settled, even the language of his religion and of the synagogue, in which we should expect to find most conservatism, became Greek. In Jerusalem itself there were Greek synagogues where the Hellenistic Jews and proselytes worshipped. Of great interest is the broken lintel-inscription found at Corinth /ΤΩΓΗΕΒΡ/, which is to be completed as ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ ΕΒΡΑΙΩΝ, and may well have belonged to the Jewish synagogue in which Paul preached (Acts 18 4).<sup>17</sup>

The extant unliterary Koinê is not the only evidence against Semitisms and Jewish Greek. It is just possible that the ubiquitous Jew or roving Semite, when he found himself with his compatriots in distant parts of Egypt or Asia Minor, or in the cities of Greece, there spoke and wrote his Greek with a few not quite obliterated Semitic peculiarities disagreeable to his neighbors. But when we find the evidence of inscriptions, papyri, and ostraca borne out by the popular Greek of the present day, when we find these quondam Semitisms leading their own natural life in the colloquial language of the villages of modern Greece, we have a conclusive argument against the theory that magnifies coincidences into Semitisms.

The protagonist of the use of modern Greek to support this argument is Thumb. He points out, for example, that *ὄνομα* in the signification of "person" (found in the papyri) is exactly the modern Greek *νομάτοι*.<sup>18</sup> He parallels the *hébraïsme pur* of Viteau, *καὶ ὁ οἶκος οὗτος ὁ ὑψηλός, πᾶς ὁ διαπορευόμενος αὐτὸν ἐκστῆσαι* (LXX, 2 Chron. 7 21) from a fifteenth-century poem, where no one will suspect Hebraism: *ἡ πόλις ἡ ἀγάπη σου, ἐπῆραν*

<sup>17</sup> Now in the Museum of Corinth. See *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xviii, 1898, p. 333; *American Journal of Archaeology*, 1903, pp. 60-61.

<sup>18</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 123.

τὴν οἱ Τοῦρκοι.<sup>19</sup> Similarly Psichari has made large use of modern Greek, as has Moulton in his *Prolegomena*.

The New Testament language in its phonetics, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary, is thus seen to be a living plastic language, with a life of its own quite independent of Hebrew or Aramaic. One finds practically all the same phenomena in contemporary Greek.

Besides the books already named other works in New Testament philology must be more briefly mentioned. Thus the writings of W. M. Ramsay of Aberdeen have shown in a very practical way how the New Testament text may be studied, both historically and philologically, in the light of ancient Greek inscriptions.

A great service has been rendered by the New Testament concordances of Bruder (1842, '1888) and of Moulton and Geden (1897), the former of which is to appear in a new edition revised by Schmiedel. Bruder's has the practical advantage for students that it gives the full Greek text of the references in the case of all the prepositions and even for the particles *καί* and *δέ*. It has the disadvantage of being mainly based on the Textus Receptus, although the last edition takes account of the principal deviations of Tregelles and of Westcott and Hort. The concordance of Moulton and Geden omits *καί* and *δέ* altogether, and for some words gives lists of mere references without the Greek text; prepositions, for instance, which always govern the same case are "treated compendiously." It has the advantage that it gives "the text of the Greek Testament as set forth in the latest and best critical editions," Westcott and Hort's text being taken as a standard with which are compared the texts of the eighth edition of Tischendorf and of the English Revisers.

In the field of grammar Winer has formed the groundwork

<sup>19</sup> Op. cit., p. 131, cf. p. 127, "Bevor jemand von der biblischen Gräcitat behauptet, 'l'hébreu a donc exercé une influence profonde sur l'emploi des voix et sur leur signification,' sollte er sich die mittel- und neugriechische Grammatik genau ansehen; denn es geht schlechterdings nicht mehr ohne deren Studium, wenn man die Sprache der griechischen Bibel beurteilen will." A careful study of Hatzidakis, *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, 1892, Thumb, *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache*, 1895, and Dieterich, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache von der hellenistischen Zeit bis zum X. Jahrhundert nach Christo*, 1898, will shake the faith of any believer in Semitisms.

for most New Testament grammars since published. In its English translations by J. H. Thayer (1869) and W. F. Moulton (1870) it has presided over the exegesis of nearly half a century in England and America. In 1859 appeared the not-yet-forgotten grammar of Alexander Buttmann (English translation by Thayer, 1873), which carried on the traditions of Winer. A better known work is the grammar of F. Blass,<sup>20</sup> the first edition of which appeared while Blass still labored under the shackles of the old theories, so that he writes of New Testament Greek that it is "a special idiom, following its own laws," and among the phenomena of the language finds many Semitisms. In the second edition his point of view had slightly changed; he took a more cautious position on the burning question of Semitisms, and called in modern Greek to his service, acknowledging that New Testament Greek shows "an intermediate stage on the road from ancient to modern Greek."

Two years earlier than Blass, in 1894, began to appear the eighth edition of Winer, revised and enlarged by P. W. Schmiedel,<sup>21</sup> and it is still in progress. This is a work of decided merit, in which the reviser bravely endeavored to bring to bear modern philological science. Unfortunately for his work, he began a little too early for the use of the new papyri. Deissmann remarks that there is "too much Winer and too little Schmiedel."

Burton's work, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* (1888, '1900), has remained the best authority in its department to the present day. The appearance of a translation into Dutch (1906) with additions by de Zwaan bears testimony to its merits.

The two volumes of the *Étude sur le Grec du Nouveau Testament* by Viteau are top-heavy and destined to fall under the weight of the *énorme mélange d'hébraïsmes*. Viteau is enslaved entirely to the old school, he sees in the Greek of the New Testament (and Septuagint) almost as many Hebraisms as Schlatter.

<sup>20</sup> *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, 1896, <sup>2</sup> 1902, English translation, 1898, second edition, revised and enlarged, 1905.

<sup>21</sup> I. Theil, *Einleitung und Formenlehre*, 1894; II. Theil, *Syntax*, 1. Heft, 1897, 2. Heft, 1898. Schmiedel's attention having been diverted to other subjects, E. Schwyzer will assist in the completion of this long-delayed publication.

Moreover analogy will account for a great many of the sins of his "Judaean-Christian" Greek. In his works, however, we have a useful collection of material and many suggestive remarks.

Finally we come to the *magnum opus* of recent New Testament grammatical work, the *Prolegomena* of Professor James Hope Moulton, a book of great timeliness, which has been heartily welcomed by scholars. Moulton's grammar is based firmly on the new foundations, and is beyond doubt the most independent New Testament grammar that has appeared since Winer's first edition. His first volume, which prefaces the systematic grammar with "a general sketch of Hellenistic language and the position of the New Testament writers in its development," is mainly devoted to a singularly successful attempt at "a readable account of the history and characteristics of Common Greek, bringing in . . . the newly available evidence which might assist the New Testament scholar," and leaves the conviction behind "that the New Testament from the linguistic point of view stands in the most vital connection with the Hellenistic world surrounding it." All who are interested in New Testament study must eagerly await the appearance of a second volume from the same careful pen.

Another New Testament grammar has been for some time in preparation by L. Radermacher, known from his contributions to classical journals, and is to appear as the opening part of the first volume of Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*.<sup>22</sup>

In the department of New Testament Lexicography no such high point of excellence has yet been attained as in that of grammar. Over the existing lexicons it may fairly be said that *hic jacet* has already been written. Grimm's revision of Wilke's *Clavis Novi Testamenti philologica* (1862-68, '1903) did good service in its day. It was translated, improved, and granted a longer life in the two editions of J. H. Thayer's *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (1886), which remains to this day admittedly the best lexicon available. H. Cremer's

<sup>22</sup> In his preface to *A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, New York, 1908, A. T. Robertson announces that he has already written a number of chapters of a "larger grammar of the Greek New Testament on the scale of Winer," which he will finish as rapidly as possible.

*Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräcität* (1866, <sup>9</sup>1902) is a laborious collection of valuable material, but was unscientific from the beginning.

From Dutch scholars come two lexicons which, though not directly or solely devoted to the New Testament, can be used with advantage. Especially commendable is van Herwerden's *Lexicon Graecum suppletorium et dialecticum*, with the *Appendix* to the same.<sup>23</sup> These volumes give us a useful collection of material, considerably extending our knowledge of Hellenistic Greek; no New Testament student can afford to neglect them.<sup>24</sup> The *Grieksch-theologisch woordenboek hoofdzakelijk van de oud-christelijke letterkunde* of J. M. S. Baljon (1895-99) covers not only the New Testament but also the Septuagint and the early Christian literature. It is said to be virtually a translation of Cremer, and to be deficient in philological accuracy and over-attentive to belated and useless etymologies.

A new Lexicon for the New Testament and early Christian literature by E. Preuschen has for some time been in progress, and three parts have appeared.<sup>25</sup> One purpose of Preuschen's work is to render a concordance practically unnecessary, but since we already possess reliable concordances, this is a doubtful merit. References are given for the usages of New Testament words in the apocryphal writings, while references from profane literature and from the later ecclesiastical writers are lacking. A decided demerit is the silence as to papyri and inscriptions. It promises but little advance on existing New Testament lexicons.

Here should be mentioned the "Lexical Notes from the Papyri" by J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, begun in the *Expositor* for January, 1908, and various monographs and articles by Nägeli, Wendland, Thieme, Nachmanson, and Heitmüller. The scope of this paper does not permit notice of other important works

<sup>23</sup> Leyden, 1902; Appendix, 1904; "Nova addenda," in *Mélanges Nicole*, Geneva, 1905.

<sup>24</sup> Deissmann, "Die Sprache der griechischen Bibel," in *Theologische Rundschau*, 1906, p. 223.

<sup>25</sup> Vollständiges griechisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, 1908-.

on the Koinê and on modern Greek from Dieterich, Hatzidakis, Thumb, Mayser, Krumbacher, Kretschmer, Psichari, and others.

On Deissmann's instructive article on "New Testament Philology" in the *Expositor* for January, 1908, one may venture two criticisms. First, Deissmann has not sufficiently emphasized the suggestiveness of E. A. Abbott's *Johannine Grammar* (1906).<sup>26</sup> This is little wonder; Abbott's grammar was antiquated the moment it came from the press, for his investigation has been pursued altogether from the old classical standpoint, and with too little attention to Hellenistic Greek. But he has been a pioneer in the careful study of the language of individual writers of the New Testament. Deissmann admits the "great need of critical studies of the style of the separate books of the New Testament," and Moulton observes that the varieties of culture in the different books are "sufficiently marked to make it imperative on us to take each author by himself, assigning him his place on the 'grammatometer' which we may construct by the aid of the papyri."<sup>27</sup> Here is abundant scope for students of Hellenistic Greek equipped with Abbott's careful and patient scholarship; we stand as much in need of a Pauline or Lukan grammar as of a Johannine.<sup>28</sup> Such works would be of more than ephemeral value and would doubtless help to settle many troublesome questions in Pauline and Lukan criticism.

Secondly, while Deissmann has shown how the New Testament must be studied in the light of the inscriptions, papyri, and ostraca, he has made no mention of the aid to be had for forms, syntax, and meaning of words from modern popular Greek, the direct lineal descendant of the Koinê. Theoretically the advantage for the New Testament of the study of modern Greek was

<sup>26</sup> See the reviews by J. H. Moulton in *American Journal of Theology*, Jan. 1907, pp. 157-164, and by T. Nicklin in *Classical Review*, xx, p. 172.

<sup>27</sup> *The Science of Language and the Study of the New Testament*, Manchester, 1906, p. 20.

<sup>28</sup> But cf. Winer-Schmiedel, p. 3, "Eine Specialgrammatik einzelner nt. Autoren erscheint unnötig. Das Individuelle der Diction des Johannes, des Paulus etc. bewegt sich fast nur in dem Gebiete der Wörter und Phrasen (Lieblingsausdrücke) oder fällt dem rhetorischen Element anheim. Die Grammatik wird nur selten davon berührt, häufiger nur bei der Apokalypse."

known and admitted many years ago, as for instance by W. F. Moulton in his translation of Winer. It is a pity that the following words of Geldart, written in 1870, did not produce more effect: "The Greek of the present day affords a better commentary on the language of Polybius, of the Septuagint, and of the New Testament than either the writings of contemporary historians, rhetoricians, grammarians, or philosophers, who, for the most part, wrote a purely artificial Greek."<sup>29</sup> With this agree the words of J. H. Moulton: "We find in the Greek of today . . . and the folk-songs of modern Hellas, or the Gospels as translated into the vulgar tongue by Pallis, an aid to the Greek Testament study which no grammarian can afford to ignore." Psichari goes so far as to say that to estimate the Septuagint at its proper value as a philological document, one ought to translate it entirely into the most popular modern Greek.

In the interpretation of the New Testament the first slight attempt at a practical application of modern Greek has been made by A. Pallis in his *A Few Notes on the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Matthew*,<sup>30</sup> in which, for example, he explains the ἡμέρα εὐκαιρος of Mark 6 21 as meaning "an empty day," "a day without work," not "a convenient day."

But New Testament students now stand in need of a complete new set of modern scientific commentaries. The authors of such commentaries must write with the monuments of colloquial contemporary Greek before them and with a considerable knowledge of modern Greek. The light from the recently discovered sources will show, for example, that the Friend of sinners and of the poor knew the circumstances of their daily life even to the market-value of sparrows, when he said, "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing?" (Mt. 10 29), or "Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings?" (Lk. 12 6).<sup>31</sup> Modern discoveries will teach us the better to appreciate the New Testament by showing us that it is the book of humanity and for humanity just because

<sup>29</sup> The Modern Greek Language, Oxford, 1870, p. 102.

<sup>30</sup> Liverpool, 1903; see Thumb, "Die Forschungen über die hellenistische Sprache in den Jahren 1902-4," in Archiv für Papyrusforschung, 1906, p. 460.

<sup>31</sup> See Deissmann, Licht vom Osten, p. 196.



it has not despised the common language of every day.<sup>32</sup> It has helped to preserve from destruction the popular language of its own day, a language parallel to that popular Greek language of the present which scholars like Psichari, Pallis, and others are trying to reduce to written record.

Very worthy beginnings of such commentaries have already been made for some of the books of the New Testament. First should be mentioned the admirable work of George Milligan on the epistles to the Thessalonians (1908). In the same line but not all of equal merit are Lietzmann's Romans and First and Second Corinthians, Klostermann and Gressmann's Mark,<sup>33</sup> W. C. Allen's Matthew (1907), J. Armitage Robinson's Ephesians (1903, <sup>2</sup>1904), and Zahn's commentary on John (1908).

All the problems of the grammar of the New Testament and the Koinê are not yet settled, and will not be even when Moulton and Radermacher and Robertson have completed their grammars. Moulton's *Prolegomena* gives many hints of detailed investigations that are urgently needed.

The New Testament manuscripts call for fresh consideration in the light of what we now know of the Koinê. Thus we have fresh criteria to apply in order to determine provenance. Such apparently trivial phenomena as the wavering use of vowels, itacism, aspiration, psilosis, the conduct of *v*-movable, the interchange of the three orders of mutes, must be carefully estimated by the textual critic. The investigation of the great uncial manuscripts in the light of the established dialectic differences in the Koinê, especially those of pronunciation, has an important bearing on the determination of the place and even the time of their writing, and so contributes to the pressing problem of localizing the great types of text.<sup>34</sup> A scribe would be prone to betray the

<sup>32</sup> While the New Testament is predominantly colloquial language, we ought not to go so far as Deissmann in maintaining that it is *in toto* colloquial, but must recognize in authors like Paul and Luke varying degrees of literary language, though a literary language in sympathy with the vernacular.

<sup>33</sup> These four in Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 1906-1909.

<sup>34</sup> Conversely our uncial MSS. may assist in studying dialectic differences in the Koinê.

provincialisms of his own locality.<sup>35</sup> Our materials, however, need to be handled with caution; a given criterion may point equally to two widely different regions, for instance both to Egypt and to Asia Minor. Again a scribe of a certain environment and training, copying a manuscript of alien type, would consciously or unconsciously remove apparently trivial characteristics in his exemplar—a process which would blur the differences between local types.

The greatest need of the present day is a New Testament lexicon, but it is a herculean task. To its author *honus propter onus*. Many monographs and separate pieces of work have already appeared which will serve the purpose of such a lexicon. Among these may be mentioned Moulton and Milligan's "Lexical Notes from the Papyri," referred to above, the works of Nägeli, Mayser, Helbing, Völker, Anz, etc. The author of such a lexicon must take into account all the usages and peculiarities of the words and expressions as reflected in all available inscriptions, papyri, and ostraca, and in all extant authors of the Hellenistic period from Alexander the Great until 500 or 600 A.D., emphasizing especially the colloquial language to which for the most part the New Testament belongs. The scope of a New Testament lexicon has been often outlined by Deissmann,<sup>36</sup> and in his latest book he has defined the three chief requisites as (1) "the bringing of the New Testament vocabulary into living linguistic contact with the surrounding world," (2) "careful ascertainment of the successive phases of change in meanings," (3) "a fresh apprehension in their simplicity and vitality of the ideas of popular early Christianity,—that body of ideas which a pedantic scholastic prejudice has isolated and so has made to seem complicated, artificial, and lifeless." It is gratifying to know that the scholar who has conceived so lofty an idea of the scope of the task is himself engaged in the preparation of a New Testament lexicon.

But the task of New Testament philology is not done when we

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, p. 179; and "Die sprachgeschichtliche Stellung des biblischen Griechisch," in *Theologische Rundschau*, 1902, p. 97.

<sup>36</sup> *Licht vom Osten*, pp. 300–301; also *Expositor*, 1908, p. 72; *New Light on the New Testament*, p. 111.

have found the relation of our texts to the popular speech of their day and also studied them with the aid of modern Greek. We must not overlook the importance of the Byzantine literature, the study of which has in this generation received an impetus from the work of such philologists as Krumbacher, Thumb, and Dieterich, and from the establishment of the Leipzig *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* in 1892.<sup>37</sup>

In comparison with the remains of the earlier Hellenistic period and with modern Greek, the Byzantine literature, written in the "mummified Byzantine language," as Hatzidakis calls it, can rank only second in importance. It is not so natural, direct, trustworthy; we find in it too much affectation, learned censorship, and archaism. One can easily recognize this in the papyri of this later period, from which we get but little help in forms and still less in syntax. Yet the Byzantine literature is valuable lexically, as well as from the numerous direct statements made by its scholars and grammarians. What they scorn as unworthy of the language of a past golden age is to us often of special interest.

It thus appears that the New Testament language has now been rescued from its long scholastic isolation, due to theological prejudice and classical contempt, and restored to its rightful place as the greatest and most interesting monument of the Koinê. It must therefore be studied in the light of the Greek which preceded it, that of its own day, that of the Byzantine period, and modern Greek.

Further, any one familiar with the Synoptic Gospels will readily perceive that at every step the New Testament student must call in a first-hand knowledge of Palestinian Aramaic in order to make any progress towards a solution of the synoptic problem. The promise of such a method can be seen in Wellhausen's *Einführung*. Greater results could have been attained if Wellhausen had combined with his wide knowledge of Aramaic as wide a knowledge of Hellenistic Greek. This is a field, however, which all cannot enter, as all cannot be at the same time specialists in

<sup>37</sup> For a brief survey of the literature of this period see K. Krumbacher, "Die griechische Literatur des Mittelalters" in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, I, 8, p. 287 ff., and a detailed account in his *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches*, 21897.

Hellenistic and in Aramaic. It is a work which the philologist must do, the theologian as ever reaping the harvest whether thirty or a hundredfold.

The New Testament, written in "the queenliest tongue ever spoken on this earth," and clothed in the linguistic dress of its own day, claims its due and large place in the history of that language; it is of all books in the Greek tongue the one on which least effort after art and outward grace has been spent, and yet is the greatest book of that wonderful language, and to its interpretation must be brought all the past results, and many not yet gathered, of the study of Greek philology.